DAIMLERCHRYSLER

DaimlerChrysler Intellectual Capital Corporation

RECEIVED CENTRAL FAX CENTER

APR 2 4 2007



 Fax:
 Examiner Justin I. Michalski
 From:
 Gordon K. Harris, Jr., Reg. No. 28,615

 Fax:
 Pages:
 12 + Fee trans. + cover

 (571) 273-8300
 Date:
 Aprill 2/2, 2007

Group Art Unit: 2615

Re: Application No. 09/833,183

Attached is an Appeal Brief; Fee Transmittal

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being facsimile transmitted to the Patent and Trademark Office (Fax No. (571) 273-8300) on April 29, 2007.

Susan J. Sidwell

Dusan J. Didwell

This communication contains confidential information which is intended only for the use of the addressee. It may also contain information that is protected by the Attomey-Client Privilege or the Work Product Doctrine. Copying or distribution of this communication by persons other than the addressee is prohibited. If you have received this communication in error, please notify us immediately by telephone and return the original message to us at the address below by United States mail. Thank you.

PTO/SB/17 (12-04)
Approved for use through 07/31/2006, DMB 0651-0032
U.S. Patent and Trademark Office; U.S. DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
Under the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995, no persons are required to respond to a collection of information unless it displays a valid OMB control number.

EEE TO A NOMITTAL					Complete If Known	HECKI	
FEE TRANSMITTAL Application Number		umber	0	09/833,183 CEN	YTRAL FA	(CENT	
for FY 2005		Filing Date		1	April 11, 2001		1 2007
Effective 10/01/2004. Patent fees are subject to annual revision.		First Named Inventor			Hinkle et al.		£ 400/
	Exami	ner Nar	me		lustin I. Michalski		
Applicant claims small entity status. See 37 CFR 1.27	Art Un	it		2	2815		
TOTAL AMOUNT OF PAYMENT (\$) 500	Attom	ey Dock	ket No.	7	05570US1	$\overline{}$	
METHOD OF PAYMENT (check all that apply)	+			ECC ^	ALCUITATION (continued)		
		DITIO	NAL FE		ALCULATION (continued)		
☐ Check ☐ Credit card ☐ Money ☐ Other ☐ None Order		Entity		allEntit	Y		
Deposit Account:	Fen Code	Foe (\$)	Fee	Fee (\$)	Fee Description	Fee Paid	
Deposit	1051	130	2051	66	Surcharge - late filing fee or oath		
Account 03-1800 Number	1052	50	2052	25	Surcharge - late provisional filing fee or cover sheet.		
Deposit	1053	130	1053	130	Non-English specification		
Account DaimlerChrysler Intellectual Capital Company LLC	1812 1804	2,520 920*	1812	2,520 920°	For filing a request for reexamination		
Name	11904	920-	1804	320	Requesting publication of SIR prior to Exeminer action		
The Director is authorized to: (check all that apply) ☐ Charge fee(s) indicated below ☐ Credit any overpayments	1805	1.840*	1805	1.840*	Requesting publication of SIR after Examiner action		
☐ Charge any additional fee(s) under 37 CFR 1.16 and 1.17	1251	120	2251	60	Extension for reply within first month	 	
Charge fee(s) indicated below, except for the filing fee to the above-identified deposit account.	1252	450	2252	225	Extension for reply within second		
FEE CALCULATION	1253	1020	2253	510	month Extension for reply within third month	 	
1. BASIC FILING FEE	1254	1,590	2254	795	Extension for reply within fourth	H	
Large Entity Small Entity	1255	2,160	2255	1080	month	├ ─┤!	
Fee Fee Fee Fee Description Code (\$) Code (\$) Fee Paid	1401	2,160 500	2401	250	Extension for reply within titth month Notice of Appeal	H	
1011 300 2011 150 Utility filing fee	1402	500	2402	250	Fiting a brief in support of an appeal	500	
1012 200 2012 100 Design filing fee	1403	1000	2403	500	Request for oral hearing		
1013 200 2013 100 Plant filling fee	1452 1453	500 1500	2452 2463	250 750	Patition to revive — unavoidable		
1014 300 2014 150 Reissue filing fee	1501	1400	2501	700	Petition to revive – unintentional Utility issue fee (or reissue)	1	
	1502	800	2502	400	Design issue for		
SUBTOTAL (1) \$0	1480	130	1460	130	Patitions to the Commissioner		
2. EXTRA CLAIM FEES FOR UTILITY AND REISSUE	1807	50	1807	60	Processing fee under 37 CFR 1,17 (q) Submission of Information Disclosure		
Extra Fee from Fee Claims below Peid	1800	180	1806	180	Stmt		
Total Ctalms - 20 = 0 X 0	8021	40	8021	40	Recording each patent assignment per property (times number of		
Independent					properties)		
Claims	1809	790	2909	395	Filing a submission after final rejection (37 CFR § 1.129(a))	'	
Multiple Dependent	1810	790	2810	395	For each additional invention to be		
Large Entity Small Entity	1801	790	2801	395	examined (37 CFR § 1.129(b)) Request for Continued Examination	 	
Fee Fee Fee Fee Fee Personnelle	I		1		(RCE)		
Code (\$) Code (\$) Fee Description 1202 50 2202 25 Claims in excess of 20	Other fe						
1201 200 2201 100 Independent claims in excess of 3		*Reduced by Basic Filing Foe Paid SUBTOTAL (3) (\$)500 4. SEARCH/EXAMINATION FEES					
1203 360 2203 180 Multiple dependent claim, if not paid	1111	500 Í	/EXAMI 2111	250	Utility Search Fee	<u> </u>	
1204 200 2204 100 Reliable Independent claims over original patent	1112	100	2112	50	Dealgn Search Fee		
1205 50 2205 25 Retasue claims in excess of 20 and over original patent	1113	300	2113	150	Plant Search Fee		
	1114	500 200	2114 2311	250 100	Reissue Search Fee Utility Examination Fee		
SUBTOTAL (2) \$0	1312	130	2312	65	Design Examination Fee	+-+1	
	1313	160	2313	80	Plant Examination Fee		
	1314	600	2314	300	Reissue Examination Fee		
					SUBTOTAL (4)		
İ	**						
TOTAL FEES ENCLOSED: \$500							
SUBMITTED BY					Complete (if epplicable)		
Name (Print/Type) Gordon K. Hurris Registration No.		25	816		7040\ 044 055		
Name (Print/Type) Gordon K. Hurris (Augresy/Apart) Signature		28	615		Telephone (248) 944-652		
				- 1	Date 1 402 / 2 at 1 2 a	es #	

P.03/14

RECEIVED CENTRAL FAX CENTER

APR 2 4 2007

Attorney Docket No. 705570US1

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Group Art Unit:	2615			
xaminer: Justin I. Michalski		APPEAL BRIE		
Serial No.	09/833,183	, <u></u>		
Applicants:	Joseph A. Hinkle			
Filed:	April 11, 2001			
For:	RADIO DISTORTION) PROCESSING)			
Attorney Docket No.:	705570US1	1		

Commissioner for Patents P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Dear Sir:

This is an appeal from the Final Rejection of Claims 1-13 under 35 U.S.C. § 103 (a) in the Final Office Action mailed November 14, 2006.

04/25/2007 EAYALEW1 00000001 031800 09833183 | REAL PARTY IN INTEREST

The real party in interest is DaimlerChrysler Corporation, a corporation organized and existing under the laws of the State of Delaware U.S.A., and having a principal place of business in Auburn Hills, Michigan, U.S.A.

II. RELATED APPEALS AND INTERFERENCES

There are no related appeals or interferences which would directly affect or be directly affected by or have a bearing on the Board's decision in the instant Appeal.

III. STATUS OF THE CLAIMS

Claims 14-18 have been withdrawn from consideration and were previously canceled.

Claims 1-13 are pending in this application. All pending Claims have been rejected and are the subject of this Appeal. A copy of Claims 1-13 is set forth in the Appendix hereto.

IV. STATUS OF AMENDMENTS

The Final Office Action of November 14, 2006 included rejections to the Claims under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Brewer (U.S. Patent No. 5,255,324) in view of Wassink (U.S. Publication No. 5,633,940). Applicants filed a Response After Final Rejection on January 3, 2007, with no further amendment to the pending Claims. A Notice of Appeal was filed March 13, 2007.

V. <u>SUMMARY OF THE CLAIMED SUBJECT MATTER</u>

An audio distortion processing system (10 of FIG. 1) includes a first processing unit (16 of FIG. 1) adapted to be in communication with an audio source (12 of FIG. 1) wherein the first processing unit (16 of FIG. 1) controls a plurality of parameters. A plurality of inputs (18, 20, 22 of FIG. 1, and Paragraph [0014]) communicate with the first processing unit (16 of FIG. 1), the plurality of inputs (18, 20, 22 of FIG. 1) respectively indicating values of the plurality of parameters. A power amplifier (24 of FIG. 1 and Paragraph [0014]) in electrical communication with the first processing unit (16 of FIG. 1) for receiving an output signal of the first processing unit (16 of FIG. 1), the power amplifier (24 of FIG. 1) selectively generating a clipping signal (Paragraph [0015]), the power amplifier (24 of FIG. 1) adapted to be in communication with at least one speaker (26 of FIG. 1). A second processing unit (14 in FIG. 1) in electrical communication with the power amplifier (24 of FIG. 1) and the first processing unit (16 of FIG. 1) for receiving the clipping signal

from the power amplifier (24 of FIG. 1) and sending control signals to the first processing unit (16 of FIG. 1). A plurality of inputs in communication with the second processing unit, the plurality of inputs respectively indicating values of the plurality of parameters.

The control signals initiate an incremental reduction in a level of a first parameter of the plurality of parameters until one of ether the clipping signal recedes or a reduction limit of the first parameter is achieved. (FIG. 3 and Paragraph [0017]-[0018].) The control signals then apply an incremental reduction in a level of a second parameter of the plurality of parameters if a reduction limit of the first parameter is achieved and the clipping signal persists. (Id.) The control signals also initiate an incremental recovery of an original level of the second parameter if the clipping signal is not detected. (FIG. 4 and Paragraph [0020].) and then an incremental recovery of an original level of the second parameter is fully recovered and the clipping signal is not detected. (Id.)

VI. GROUNDS OF REJECTION TO BE REVIEWED ON APPEAL

Presented for review is the rejection of Claims 1-13 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Brewer (U.S. Patent No. 5,255,324) in view of Wassink (U.S. Publication No. 5,633,940).

VII. ARGUMENTS

Claims 1-13 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Brewer (U.S. Patent No. 5,255,324) in view of Wassink (U.S. Publication No. 5,633,940). The rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claim 1 includes both incrementally reducing the first parameter before the second parameter in the event of clipping and incrementally recovering an original level of the second parameter before incrementally recovering an original level of the first parameter. This combination of elements is not taught or suggested by Brewer and Wassink either alone or in combination.

The Final Office Action of November 14, 2006 recognized that Brewer does not disclose recovering a first parameter after a second parameter is fully recovered. (Final Office Action, Page 4.) The Final Office Action asserted that Wassink mentions different orders of affecting parameter settings, and the combination of Brewer and Wassink is obvious. However, neither Wassink nor Brewer disclose or suggest that the claimed order would be in any way beneficial.

According to M.P.E.P. § 2143.01, "[t]he mere fact that references can be . . . modified does not render the resultant combination obvious unless the prior art also suggests the desirability of [such modification]." In re Mills, 916 F.2d 680, 16 U.S.P.Q.2d 1430 (Fed. Cir. 1990). That one of skill in the art has the capabilities to arrive at the invention is not the test for whether one of skill in the art would have arrived at the invention based on the teachings of the prior art. *Ex parte Levengood*, 28 U.S.P.Q.2d 1300, 1301-02 (Bd. Pat. App. & Inter. 1993) ("That which is within the capabilities of one skilled in the art is not synonymous with obviousness"). It is improper to use the inventor's disclosure as an instruction book on how to reconstruct the prior art. *Panduit Corp. v. Dennison Mfg. Co.*, 1 USPQ2d 1593 (Fed. Cir. 1987). Both the suggestion and the expectation of success must be founded in the prior art and not in Applicant's disclosure. *In re Farrell*, 7 USPQ2d 1673 (Fed. Cir. 1988) (emphasis added.).

As best understood by the Applicants, the Final Office Action asserts that it would have been obvious to modify the audio distortion processing system of Brewer by providing parameter recovery in reverse order to provide maximum audio output and to avoid output signal distortion. However, obviousness must be determined at the time that the invention was made. 35 U.S.C. §103. The relevant prior art that should be considered is only that which he or she would have

selected without the advantage of hindsight or knowledge of the invention. *Union Carbide Corp. v. American Can Co.*, 220 USPQ 584 (Fed. Circ. 1984).

The combination of Claim 1 primarily reduces noticability/perceivability of audio distortion reduction processes for listeners by initially reducing narrowband gain and then by initially recovering wideband gain. (Paragraph [0021].) In contrast, Brewer is directed to a system for improving sound quality by merely reducing clipping in an audio spectrum, as is common in the art. Brewer does not appear to contemplate initial recovery of wideband gain. Further, Wassink is directed to a system *increasing perceivability* of volume adjustment. (Column 1, Lines 44-47.) Wassink is not directed to *reducing* noticability of audio distortion. Therefore it is unclear as to why one of ordinary skill in the art would combine the references as proposed. It is therefore respectfully submitted that the Examiner has not made a legally sufficient showing of a motivation to combine based on actual, specific, evidence.

Since the Examiner has offered no proper support or motivation for combining the references other than an unsupported assertion that the combination would be beneficial, it is respectfully submitted that the rejection based on obviousness is clearly and unequivocally founded upon "knowledge gleaned only from applicant's disclosure." M.P.E.P. § 2145. Consequently, it is respectfully submitted that the rejection entails hindsight and is, therefore, improper.

Claim 1 is believed to be allowable for at least these reasons. Claim 8 is believed to be allowable for at least similar reasons as Claim 1. Claims 2-7 and 9-13 depend from Claims 1 and 8 and are believed to be allowable for at least this reason.

VIII. SUMMARY

The cited references, taken separately or in combination, fail to disclose or suggest every limitation in Applicants' pending Claims. Therefore, the Examiner has failed to establish a *prima facie* case of unpatentability, and the rejection of Claims 1-13 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) should be reversed.

Respectfully submitted,

Joseph A. Hinkle

Dated: April 21, 2007

Gordon K. Harris, Jr., Reg. No. 28,615

Attorney for Applicants

Ralph E. Smith
DaimlerChrysler Intellectual Capital Company LLC
CIMS 483-02-19
800 Chrysler Drive East
Auburn Hills, Michigan 48326-2757

Phone: (248) 944-6519.

CLAIMS APPENDIX

Listing of Claims

- An audio distortion processing system comprising:
- a first processing unit adapted to be in communication with an audio source wherein said first processing unit controls a plurality of parameters;
- a plurality of inputs in communication with said first processing unit, said plurality of inputs respectively indicating values of said plurality of parameters;
- a power amplifier in electrical communication with said first processing unit for receiving an output signal of said first processing unit, said power amplifier selectively generating a clipping signal, said power amplifier adapted to be in communication with at least one speaker;
- a second processing unit in electrical communication with said power amplifier and said first processing unit for receiving said clipping signal from said power amplifier and sending control signals to said first processing unit; and
- a plurality of inputs in communication with said second processing unit, said plurality of inputs respectively indicating values of said plurality of parameters;
- wherein said control signals initiate an incremental reduction in a level of a first parameter of said plurality of parameters until one of ether said clipping signal recedes or a reduction limit of said first parameter is achieved and then incremental reduction in a level of a second parameter of said plurality of parameters if a reduction limit of said first parameter is achieved and said clipping signal persists; and
- an incremental recovery of an original level of said second parameter if said clipping signal is not detected and then an incremental recovery of an original level

of said first parameter ensures if said original level of said second parameter is fully recovered and said clipping signal is not detected.

- 2. The audio distortion processing system of claim 1, wherein said reduction limit of said first parameter is a function of a first input of said plurality of inputs.
- 3. The audio distortion processing system of claim 1, wherein said reduction limit of said first parameter is equal to one half of said original level of said first parameter.
- 4. The audio distortion processing system of claim 1, wherein said reduction limit of said second parameter is a function of said reduction limit of said first parameter.
- 5. The audio distortion processing system of claim 1, wherein a reduction limit of said second parameter is equal to the difference between a maximum reduction value of said second parameter and said reduction limit of said first parameter.
- 6. The audio distortion processing system of claim 1, wherein said first parameter is bass and a corresponding first input of the plurality of inputs is operator selectable bass boost.

- 7. The audio distortion processing system of claim 1, wherein said second parameter is volume and a corresponding second input of the plurality of inputs is operator selectable volume level.
- 8. A method for controlling distortion in an audio system having first and second parameters wherein each of said parameters is a function of an operator input, and method comprising the steps of:

determining a reduction limit of said first parameter; determining a reduction limit of said second parameter; detecting a clipping signal in said audio system;

incrementally reducing a level of said first parameter until one of either said clipping signal recedes or said reduction limit of said first parameter is achieved;

incrementally reducing a level of said second parameter if said reduction limit of said first parameter is achieved and said clipping signal persists; and

incrementally recovering an original level of said second parameter if said clipping signal is not detected and then incrementally recovering an original level of said first parameter if said original level of said second parameter is fully recovered and said clipping signal is not detected.

9. The method of claim 8, wherein said first parameter is a bass parameter and said second parameter is a volume parameter.

- 10. The method of claim 8, wherein said reduction limit of said first parameter is a function of an operator input.
- 11. The method of claim 8, wherein said reduction limit of said first parameter is equal to one half of an operator selectable first parameter level.
- 12. The method of claim 8, wherein said reduction limit of said second parameter is a function of said reduction limit of said first parameter.
- 13. The method of claim 8, wherein said reduction limit of said second parameter is equal to the difference between a maximum reduction limit of said second parameter and said reduction limit of said first parameter.

EVIDENCE APPENDIX

None.

RELATED PROCEEDINGS APPENDIX

None.